No. F. IX-4

Previous References

193 &
(Nagar)

Reserve
File No. 122-36
Serial Nos. 1 - 2

Letter References.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for Re-erection

SUBJECT.

Management of Sri Lakshmi Venkata-
ramana Temple Chickpet Bangalore

To the Hon'ble Chief
Secretary to Govt
Revenue Department
Bangalore

WD 0418—GPB—22,500—29-8-36

With reference to the above subject I am directed
to submit for the information of Government the
following Brief account of the

1936-7

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Muz.)

NOTES.

File No. 122-36

FILE HEADING.

Management of Sri Lalbags Venkataramana Swamy temple — Chelluppa Bangalore city.

FROM

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore — Bangalore —

M. C. No. 32/35-36 Dated 6. 10. 36 Received 8. 10. 36

Diary No. 366	Enclos. 2	Spare copies	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

States that if Government approve of his proposals specified therein he will in consultation with the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore draw up a draft Scheme of Management of Sri Lalbags Venkataramana Swamy temple and submit the same for orders —

NOTES AND ORDERS.

(1) Submit for orders —

GS 29-10-36

(2) The Muzrai Comr. states that Mr. Lodd Balamukunda Bags is prepared to accept the conditions imposed in Muzrai Comr.'s order No. R. Dis. 50 dated 5th Sept. 1930, which were ~~...~~ modified by Govt. in their order in appeal

V

Q

NOTES—First Sheet

WD 02552—GPB—5,000—10-7-30

a point for consideration whether the conditions imposed in the orders referred to above should not be fulfilled before he is appointed as sole Dharmadarsi. The Mufrasi Court's order requires him to carry out certain repairs to the temple and to construct shops for improving the income of the institution. Unless these conditions are fulfilled, he cannot be considered to have any claim to be appointed as sole Dharmadarsi of the temple. Further the suit for partition filed by him against his father has not been disposed of. Till it is disposed of he may not be in possession of sufficient money to comply with the conditions imposed by the Mufrasi Court. Till the suit is disposed of and his claim to managership of the temple recognized by the Madras High Court, Mr. Balamukunda does it does not seem to have any claim to be appointed as sole Dharmadarsi. His father Mr. Lodd Govinda Doss has not given up his claim to the managership of the matt.

Serial No.

3) The qualifications of Mr Balmukund Dss are that he may be recognised as Manager of the Temple subject to departmental rules, regulation and control and secondly that he may be recognised as Dharmadarsi with some local people as he is not a permanent resident of Banjara. As regards his appointment as Manager under the Govt. have been found stating that the previous order of Govt. in this connection could not be modified. (Mungrai file No 1. 35 para 23).

4) As regards the second portion of the M.C. that Balmukund Dss ~~exceeds~~ may be appointed as a Dharmadarsi of the Temple, the rule about the appointment of Dharmadarsi is, that the Dharmadarsi appointed should ordinarily reside within a radius, five miles from the institution, and as this case Mr Balmukund Dss lives in Madras, and whether he could look after the affairs of the Temple from there is ~~not~~ to be considered. Besides Mr. Dodd Sahib Dss or Mr Balmukund Dss have done nothing to enforce the temple, and the request of Mr Balmukund Dss to be appointed as Dharmadarsi may not await till he deposits Rs 20,000 as stand by them as per statement. Since the Hindu Govt of Madras, also is to be considered. If appointed the M.C. may be informed that the portion of

to after these words (Govt's Order)

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13-7-35

Re: Management of Sri Ekambareswara Temple - Chicacole

File No. of 193 . Ge Secret

GENERAL 5 NOV. 36

about her Balamchand Doss as Dharmadarsi may await the two Civil Suit pending in the High Court of Madras is disposed off, and also to her Balamchand Doss deposit her personal sum of Rs 20,000 for the maintenance of the temple.

2/5/11/36

Sir Henry

The Murrai Comis letter is for perusal. Whether he may be permitted to discuss the matter further with Mr Balamchand Doss is for consideration.

Thro
12/11 2/12/11

Perused. His The last representn was rejected on the advice of the Hon C. (vide his Ltr U.O. note dt 23-10-35) & I am not sure there is much use in this course - for the They are rather difficult people to deal with & perhaps the existing arrt seems all right. I shall discuss this with The Hon C when I come to Madras

5/12

9/12 Thro 9/12

9) I discussed this with the Hon. C. H. is found that the family litigation is still going on & that the sum of Rs 20000 is still under dispute. The temple has been taken over by Govt owing to the long continued neglect of the family & it will not be wise to entrust the management to him, even subject to control etc. The present state of things may therefore continue for I/

S/10
14/12

10) Inc
14/12
S/11/12

11) I/c
S/5
15/12

12) Inc
2
15/12

2 No 872 of 16/12/36 to the Muzrai Commissioner intimating that it is not desirable to entrust the management of the institution reverted to therein to the petitioner

B
18/12

File No.

of 193

Petition and Extract (2)

OFFICE OF MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN

8 - OCT. 1936

Bangalore, 5th October 1936

FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, ESQ., B A,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., M.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
General *Department*

7 OCT. 1936

SIR,

Management of the Lal Doss Sri Venkataramana Swamy Temple, Bangalore City.

Adverting to correspondence ending with your Memo No.565/Muz. date 31st October 1935 re. the above, I have the honor to forward herewith a further representation submitted by Mr. Lodd Balamukundas, son of Mr. Lodd Govindadas, Madras, stating that he is willing to enter into an agreement with the Government setting forth in un-equivocal terms the conditions laid down in the Muzrai Commissioner's order dated 5th September 1930 and confirmed by Government in their order dated 25th July 1932 and that he will assure Government that beyond indirectly aiding the speedy termination of the suit now proceeding in the High Court of Madras and realizing the amount intended for the temple charity the action of Government will, in no way, commit them or make them the partisans of the litigation and requesting that his claim to the Managership of the temple may be recognised. Mr. Lodd Balamukundas saw me on the 15th August 1936 and explained matters personally. The temple was inspected by me on 17th August 1936.

2. The past history of this temple is given in sufficient detail in this office Appeal Order No.C.2209/28-29 dated 5th September 1930 and Government Order in Muzrai Appeal No.1/31-32. The claim of Mr. Lodd Govindadas, father of the petitioner, for the management of the temple was rejected on the ground that he wanted to establish his proprietory right in the temple and its properties and the ownership of the building

he proposed to construct on a part of the land belonging to the temple. The present petitioner has, in his previous petitions and more particularly in the one now under consideration, agreed to give up any such right of proprietorship and to abide by the conditions set forth in the orders referred to above and requests to be recognised as Manager of the temple, subject to departmental control, rules and regulation. As regards the setting apart of a sum of Rs 20,000 for the benefit of the temple, the appended extract from the written statement of the First Defendant in O.S.No.176 of 1923 on the file of the High Court of Madras explains the position. It is understood that in modification of what is stated in the written statement about the reservation of the proposed upper storey for the use of the family members when they go to Bangalore for inspection and worship , the petitioner is now prepared not to press any right of residence or proprietorship in the buildings.

3. The petitioner seems to be bona fide in his intentions and wants to make a sincere effort to manage the temple and improve its resources. With the assurance given by the petitioner, that consideration of his prayer will not involve Government in any litigation, I am of opinion that the orders previously passed may be reviewed and the prayer of the petitioner favourably considered. The petitioner may be recognised as Dharmadarsi and a few local people may be associated with him as he is not a permanent resident of Bangalore. The offer of the petitioner to build shops on the Jamkhanpet side will lead to the improvement of the resources of the institution. If Government approve of the above proposals, I shall, in consulatation with the Deputy Commissioner and the petitioner, draw up a draft scheme of management embodying the conditions accepted by the petitioner and submit the same for further orders of Government.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

THE LALDOSS VENKATARAMANASWAMI TEMPLE.

The temple of Laldoss Venkataramanaswami is situated in the City of Bangalore. In the compund of this temple is also situate the - temple of Jalkanteswara Swami and also the temple of Vigneswara. This temple has been erected by the ancestors of this Defendant's family for the worship of the members of the family. A sum of Rs 20,000/- may be set apart out of the available outstandings as stated above. Out of the said sum a sum of Rs 7,500/- may be utilised for the construction of shops, the rents of which not exceeding Rs 50/- a month may be spent for the upkeep of the work in the said temple. An upper-storey may also be constructed over the shop at a cost of Rs 7,500/- for the purpose of use by the members of this family when they go to Bangalore for inspection and worship. The balance of Rs 5,000/- may be set apart as a permanent fund to meet any contingencies in the management of the temple to be utilised according to the discretion of the managing member of the family.

*****

Extract from the written statement of the 1st Defendant in O.S. No. 176 of 1923 in the High Court of Madras.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. 812 Muz 122-36-2 one file

Dated, Bangalore, 15th December 193 6

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.H.C.32/35-36 dated 6th October 1936, forwarding petition dated 25th April 1936 from Mr.Lodd Balamukundas, son of Mr.Lodd Govindadas, Madras, requesting recognition of his claim to the managership of the Lal Dass Sri Venkataramanaswami Temple, Bangalore City and submitting proposals for a review of the orders previously passed on the subject of the management of the said Institution etc., I am directed to state that your proposals do not commend themselves to Government, that the temple with its properties has been taken over by Government under their management owing to the long continued neglect of the family to which the petitioner belongs and that it is not therefore desirable to entrust the management of to the petitioner even subject to control etc. In the circumstances I am to add that the present state of things may therefore continue.

2. The petition received with your letter under advertance is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for General Secretary to Government.

S.R.2

Appendix F 6—11

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mu 3

File No. 122-36

Serial No. 2

Diary No of letter replied to 366

No. 812 Mu 1 Jetn

To

The M.C.

Sir,

With ack^e to your letter no. H-C 32/35-36 of 6.10.36. forwarding pet^n of 2874/36 from Mr Lord Balamurugadas Sons Mrs Lord Govindadas Madras requesting recognition of his claim to the Mahantship of the Lal Mosque Sri Venkataramana Swami temple - Bangalore City and Submitting proposals for a review of the orders previously passed on the subject of the management of the said Institution. I am directed to state that [illegible]

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

tne *193* .

Date of issue 16/12/36

Signed by Sitharamaiya.

List of enclosures .....

TYPING SECTION 15 DEC 1936 GENL & REVENUE SECTT

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

under their management owing to the
long-continued neglect of the family
to which the petitioner belongs and that
therefore it is not desirable to entrust the
management [illegible]
to [illegible]. In the circumstances
I am to add that the present state
of things may therefore continue.

The petition received with
your letter above referred is
herewith returned.

I have &c

9/11/14